

**Minutes
County Road Administration Board
October 10-11, 2002
CRAB Office – Olympia, Washington**

Members Present: Grant County Commissioner Tim Snead, Chair
Asotin County Commissioner Don Scheibe, Vice-Chair
Ken Stone, Cowlitz County Engineer
Randy Casteel, Kitsap County Engineer
Clark County Commissioner Judie Stanton
Garfield County Commissioner Dean Burton
Robert Breshears, Lincoln County Engineer
Walla Walla County Commissioner Dave Carey

Members Absent: Pierce County Council Member Harold Moss

Staff Present: Jay Weber, Executive Director
Walt Olsen, Deputy Director
Steve Hillesland, Assistant Director
Karen Pendleton, Executive Assistant
Chris Mudgett, Special Projects Manager
Randy Hart, Grant Programs Manager
Dave Whitcher, PMS Manager
Larry Pearson, Maintenance Manager
Jim Ayres, Design Systems Engineer**
Daniel Dickson, Systems Manager**

Guests: Representative Ruth Fisher*
Denise Tabler, Office of Financial Management/SACS*

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Snead called the County Road Administration Board quarterly meeting to order at 1:00 PM on Thursday, October 10, 2002, at the CRAB Office in Olympia.

CHAIR'S REPORT

Approve October 10-11, 2002 Agenda

Ms. Mudgett requested two items be added to the agenda under Item 7.
Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to approve the amended agenda. **Motion carried.**

(* = 1st day attendance only) (** = 2nd day attendance only)

Approve Minutes of July 11-12, 2002 CRABoard Meeting

Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Scheibe seconded to approve the minutes of the July 11-12, 2002 CRABoard meeting with amendment to page 2 in a misspelling of Commissioner Scheibe's name. **Motion carried.**

Presentation to Representatives Fisher

Chairman Snead presented a plaque in appreciation of Representative Fisher's dedicated efforts in support of transportation in the State of Washington to Representative Fisher.

DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Director's Activities/County Visits

Mr. Weber briefed the Board on his and Mr. Olsen's recent county visits to Island, Stevens, Pend Oreille, Lincoln, Snohomish and Whatcom Counties.

He discussed other activities he has completed around the state since the July meeting.

2003 CRABoard Meeting Schedule

After discussion Commissioner Scheibe moved and Mr. Breshears seconded to approve the 2003 CRABoard Meeting Schedule as proposed. **Motion carried.**

Auditor's Letter

Mr. Weber reviewed a letter from Brian Sonntag, State Auditor stating that the required one-year follow-up review of corrective action taken pursuant to RCW 42.40.040(11) in regard to whistleblower case No. 00-092 had been completed and that the Auditor's office is pleased with the actions CRAB staff has taken and they consider the matter closed.

DEPUTY DIRECTOR'S REPORT

County Engineers/Public Works Directors

Mr. Olsen reviewed the following vacancies:

- Bruce Mills has left Whatcom County after 13 years and taken a position with the Ada County Highway District in Boise, Idaho. Public Works Director Jeff Monsen has assumed County Engineer responsibilities until the position can be filled. Position is out for advertisement at this time.
- Pend Oreille County continues under Acting Engineer status with a Professional Engineer under contract.
- San Juan County continues under Interim Engineer status. Position is out for advertisement at this time.

State Auditor's Report

Mr. Olsen noted that CRAB has reviewed 25 audits since the July 2002 Board meeting. Specifically:

1. Whitman County: SAO #63560 & #63561, issued on August 9, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
2. Adams County: SAO #63569 & #63570, issued on August 16, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
3. Cowlitz County: SAO #63580 & #63581, issued on August 16, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
4. Lincoln County: SAO #63571 & #63572, issued on August 16, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
5. Asotin County: SAO #63587 & #63588, issued on August 23, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated a prior audit finding that has been resolved and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.
6. Skagit County: SAO #63702 & #63703, issued on August 23, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. Audit #63702 issued a repeat finding based on an inadequate system of internal controls to protect funds at the Guemes Island Ferry. The County has committed to improvements in the cash receipting and accounting of funds regarding the Guemes Island Ferry.
7. Grays Harbor County: SAO #63659 & #63660, issued on August 26, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
8. Lewis County: SAO #63651 & #63694, issued on August 28, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated a prior audit finding that has been resolved and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.

9. Walla Walla County: SAO #63629 & #63630, issued on August 30, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
10. Columbia County: SAO #63646 & #63647, issued on August 30, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
11. Spokane County: SAO #63611, issued on August 30, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
12. Okanogan County: SAO #63667 & #63668, issued on September 6, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.
13. Grant County: SAO #63669, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
14. Ferry County: SAO #63642 & 63643, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
15. Skamania County: SAO #63763 & 63764, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
16. Pend Oreille County: SAO #63751 & 63752, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
17. Clallam County: SAO #63720 & 63721, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
18. Whatcom County: SAO #63697 & 63698, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.

19. Jefferson County: SAO #63735 & 63736, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
20. San Juan County: SAO #63777 & 63778, issued on September 13, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
21. Pacific County: SAO #63898, issued on September 27, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
22. Klickitat County: SAO #63928, issued on September 27, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds.
23. King County: SAO #63912 & 63913, issued on September 27, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. Audit #63913 issued 4 findings. One finding was based on an inadequate system of internal controls over the administration of federally funded programs but not specific to County Road Funds. This audit also updated a prior audit finding that has been resolved and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.
24. Pierce County: SAO #63976, issued on September 27, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit did not detail any findings involving County Road Funds. .
25. Snohomish County: SAO #63971, issued on September 27, 2002 covering the period of January 1, 2001 to December 31, 2001. This audit updated a prior audit finding that has been resolved and did not detail any new findings involving County Road Funds.

Activities

Mr. Olsen reviewed a list of his activities since the July CRABoard meeting.

BUDGET

Ms. Tabler reviewed CRAB's current budget status through October 8, 2002.

The Board discussed the Rural Arterial Program fund balance.

Ms. Tabler concluded stating that CRAB's budget has been submitted to the

Office of Financial Management for their review and all Board members should have received copies of CRAB's proposed budget for 2003/2005.

RAP BUSINESS

Program Status Report

Mr. Hart reviewed a one-page Rural Arterial Program status report.

Lapsing Project Status

Mr. Hart noted that the CRABoard may at any time place a moratorium on lapsing of projects that are delayed due to CRAB initiated rescheduling and establish a new lapsing date to fit the CRABoard's programming needs.

Mr. Hart reviewed a list of three county projects facing design lapsing in 2003 and a list of fifteen county projects facing construction lapsing within 12 months.

On-line Applications Form

Mr. Hart reviewed the new Rural Arterial Program and County Arterial Preservation Programs on-line application forms available on CRAB's website.

Resolution 2002-011 – Apportionment of RATA Revenue

Mr. Hart presented Resolution 2002-011 to Apportion RATA funds to regions. The resolution distributes the accrued amount of \$5,107,536 now credited to RATA to the regions by the established 2001/2003 biennium regional percentages after setting aside \$153,226 (3%) for administration. After discussion, Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Scheibe seconded to approve Resolution 2002-011. **Motion carried.**

Clallam County Scope Change Request

Mr. Hart briefed the Board on Clallam County's letter dated April 20, 2002, requesting a scope reduction for the Draper Road project. The request is to reduce the width chosen for the project from 34 feet mph to 26 feet with no change in RATA funding.

All scope changes must be approved by the CRABoard, per CRAB Resolution 96-028, "Delegation of Authority to the Executive Director within the Rural Arterial Program," adopted October 3, 1996.

On October 4, 1996, the CRABoard approved \$500,000 in RATA funding for Draper Road. The RAP prospectus for Draper Road was submitted in

September 1994 and scored a maximum of 20 points for substandard width. The county proposed to build a 34 ft wide roadway which is wider than the standard 26 foot roadway required for roads with traffic volumes below 400 ADT. Draper Road has ADT 376, thus making the 26 ft the standard design width.

The recalculating of RAP rating points based on the 26 ft road width results in a loss of 10 points, which means the project would still have been above the funding cutoff time. The county requests approval of this reduced width with no loss of funding.

Mr. Hart concluded, recommending approval of the Draper Road Scope reduction with no loss of RATA funding.

After discussion, Commissioner Scheibe moved and Mr. Stone seconded to approve Clallam County Scope Change request for their Draper Road project. **Motion carried.**

Preliminary RAP Arrays

Mr. Hart reviewed the five Rural Arterial Program funding arrays for the 2003/2005 Biennium.

NEW BUSINESS

Budget Results Teams

Mr. Weber discussed CRAB's involvement in the Budget Results Team which meets twice a week. He noted that consolidation at this stage does not look to be part of the Governor's agenda. CRAB will continue to participate in the meetings to ensure that the group is informed of CRAB's responsibilities.

The Transportation team includes WSDOT, TIB, CRAB, and FMSIB.

Executive Request Legislation (BARS & Population)

Mr. Weber discussed proposed legislation that would change the population groups from which CRABoard members are drawn as well as changes to the day labor statutes that will align them with the recently revised BARS codes. Mr. Weber concluded that we will ask the Governor's office to propose this legislation on our behalf.

Proposed Changes to WAC – Road Log

Mr. Whitcher noted that WAC 136-60 was adopted when CRAB took over the responsibility of the maintenance of the County Roadlog from WSDOT, circa 1985. Over time, the roadlog and the update process have been refined. The proposed updated WAC better describes how the update process currently works.

Mr. Whitcher reviewed the following technical changes, creating no changes in the current roadlog and roadlog update process. The proposed WAC changes better describe the current roadlog and roadlog update process:

General changes

- Changed road log to roadlog
- Changed data base to database
- Changed data base software to database software program

WAC 136-60-010 Purpose and authority.

Included additions to the roadlog as a change that needs validation prior to inclusion in the roadlog.

WAC 136-60-020 Definitions.

- (4) Control fields – Specifies which fields are the control fields, used in the computation of gas tax allocations.
- (5) Master county roadlog – The master county roadlog contains the roadlogs of all the counties, not just the updates

WAC 136-60-030 Submittal of annual updates.

No change

WAC 136-60-040 Validation of annual updates.

Included CAPP allocation factors and RAP Region allocation factors as additional uses of the roadlog by CRAB. These programs were enacted subsequent to the adoption of WAC 136-60.

WAC 136-60-050 Validation requirements for control fields

- General – moved map requirements to last paragraph
- Responsible agency – defined responsible agency as the legislative authority of the appropriate governmental agency or the state or federal government official authorized to approve the change.
- Addition of mileage – The documentation is the official document authorizing addition of mileage

- Deletion of mileage – the documentation is the official document authorizing deletion of mileage
- Traffic volume – The County Engineer will sign a statement for all traffic volume updates in the roadlog. Typically, the County Engineer signs a cover letter indicating all updates are properly documented, which provides the needed statement.

WAC 136-60-060

Changed DOS-compatible microcomputer to Windows-compatible microcomputer

Mr. Whitcher concluded requesting that a public hearing date and time be set to consider these changes to WAC 136-320, Standards of Good Practice – Maintenance of County Roadlog.

After discussion, Commissioner Scheibe moved and Mr. Stone seconded to set a public hearing for the January 2003 CRABoard meeting to consider adoption of changes to WAC 136-320 Standard of Good Practice – Maintenance of County Roadlog. **Motion carried.**

Road Fund Diversion & the Annual Certificate of Good Practice

Ms. Mudgett discussed the relationship between the practice of diverting road funds for other uses and the Board's issuance of an Annual Certificate of Good Practice.

In late July 2002, staff received an inquiry from the Whatcom County Prosecutor's Office indicating that, after reviewing both the RCW and the WAC, they were unable to draw a connection between diversion of road funds and receipt of a Certificate of Good Practice as noted on Page 3-21 of Book I of the County Engineers' and Public Works Directors' Manual.

Page 3-21 of Book I of the Engineers' Manual states, in Section 3.C.7., under Impacts of Diversion, "Diversion of road funds also will impact a county's ability to obtain a Certificate of Good Practice and may jeopardize its gas tax revenues." Whatcom County staff, after searching the applicable statutes and administrative rules, could not find a reference to the indication that diverting road funds would result in withholding a Certificate of Good Practice and, ultimately, could result in the withholding of gas tax revenues.

In response to the question posed, CRAB staff cited **RCW 36.78.090 Certificates of good practice – Withholding of motor vehicle tax**

distribution, which states, in part, "(1) Before May 1st of each year the board shall transmit to the state treasurer certificates of good practice on behalf of the counties which during the preceding calendar year: (a) Have submitted to the state department of transportation or to the board all reports required by law of regulation of the board; and (b) Have reasonably complied with provisions of law relating to county road administration and with the standards of good practice as formulated and adopted by the board." (Emphasis added)

Chapter 36.82 RCW, entitled Roads and Bridges – Funds – Budgets, enumerates the revenues that must be deposited into the county road fund and lists the purposes for which these funds may be used.

Counties cannot be found in reasonable compliance with "provisions of law relating to county road administration" if they are in violation of any of the provisions of Chapter 36.82 RCW.

Ms. Mudgett noted the following recommendations:

1. Discontinue the practice of stating that loss of eligibility for RAP funds is the only "downside" of diverting road fund monies for other than proper road purposes.
2. Educate the counties about the possible impacts of road fund diversion on motor vehicle fuel tax revenues.
3. Drafting a specific Standard of Good Practice is optional, at the discretion of the Board.

After lengthy discussion, the Board asked staff to prepare a short presentation on Road Fund Diversion and deliver it at the January 2003 Board meeting, along with some ideas for tailoring it to be given to a variety of state and local meetings.

The Board also agreed with recommendations 1 and 2, and decided not to draft a Standard of Good Practice.

Annual Certification of Expenditure of Road Funds for Fish Passage Barrier Removal

Ms. Mudgett discussed revisions that should be made to the required documentation for Annual Certification as a result of changes made to RCW 36.82.070 and RCW 36.79.140 by the 2001 Legislature.

The 2001 Legislature amended the two abovementioned sections of the RCW to allow use of county road funds for the removal of barriers to fish passage related to county roads and limited funds that could be expended for these activities beyond the county road right-of-way.

RCW 36.82.070, Purpose for which road fund can be used, was amended to include the following: "County road purposes also include the removal of barriers to fish passage related to county roads, and include but are not limited to the following activities associated with the removal of these barriers: Engineering and technical services; stream bank stabilization; streambed restoration; the placement of weirs, rock, or woody debris; planting; and channel modification. . . ." The revised statute goes on to state that county road funds may also be used beyond the county right-of-way for "activities clearly associated with removal of fish passage barriers that are the responsibility of the county". Expenditure of funds for activities beyond the county right-of-way is limited to 25% of the total cost of activities related to fish barrier removal on any one project and the total cost of activities related to the removal of barriers beyond the county right-of-way cannot exceed one-half of one percent of a county's annual road construction budget.

To ensure that there was no conflict with RCW 36.82.070, RCW 36.79.140, Expenditures from rural arterial trust account – Approval by board, was also amended. RCW 36.79.140 now reads, in part, "Only those counties that during the preceding twelve months have spent all revenues collected for road purposes only for such purposes, including removal of barriers to fish passage and accompanying streambed and stream bank repair as specified in RCW 36.82.070, and including traffic law enforcement, as are allowed to the state by Article II, section 40 of the state Constitution, are eligible to receive funds from the rural arterial trust account." (New language is underlined.)

In order to ensure that the counties are in compliance with statute, as required by RCW 36.78.090(b), the Board must have some means of determining whether a county has met the 25% and ½% limits on expenditures expressed in RCW 36.82.070.

Presently, in the case of traffic law enforcement, the Board requires a certification from each county that the amount of money spent on traffic law enforcement in a year is at least as much as was contributed from the road fund. This certification must be signed by the County Sheriff, County

Auditor (or Finance Director), and the Chair of the Board of Commissioners or the County Executive. In addition, the Annual Certification Questionnaire asks for the date that this certification form was submitted to CRAB, as required by WAC 136-150-022.

Ms. Mudgett concluded with the following recommendations:

1. Develop a Certification Form that addresses expenditure of road funds for fish passage barrier removal and the amount of those funds spent outside county rights-of-way.
2. Revise WAC 136-150, Eligibility for Rural Arterial Trust Account Funds, to include compliance with the revised statutes.
3. Include a question regarding compliance with fish passage barrier removal requirements on the Annual Certification Questionnaire.

After Board discussion, the Board instructed staff to distribute the certification form that addresses expenditure of road funds for fish passage barrier removal and the amount of those funds spent outside county rights-of-way.

Mr. Stone moved and Commissioner Stanton seconded to hold a public hearing to revise WAC 136-50, Eligibility for Rural Arterial Trust Account Funds, to include compliance with the revised statutes. The hearing will be set for 2:00 PM January 16, 2003 in Olympia at the CRAB office.

Motion carried.

Commissioner Stanton moved and Mr. Stone seconded to approve the Annual Certification Form to include a question regarding compliance with fish passage barrier removal. **Motion carried.**

Tribal State Transportation Conference

Ms. Mudgett discussed her attendance at the Tribal State Transportation Conference.

IACC Notebooks

Ms. Mudgett distributed complementary IACC notebooks to the Board members.

Chair Snead recessed at 5:25 PM on October 10, 2002. The CRABoard meeting will resume October 11, 2002 at 9:00 A.M.

**County Road Administration Board
October 11, 2002
Friday**

CALL TO ORDER

The second day of the fall CRABoard meeting was called to order by Chair Snead at 9:10 AM on October 11, 2002.

Urban Area Transportation Boundaries

Mr. Whitcher provided information on the process of updating the Highway Urban Area boundaries.

The Highway Urban Area Boundary and the Federal Function Classes are updated based on the U.S. Census, taken every 10 years. Once the Census Bureau certifies the results, they review the census tracts to determine what the Highway Urban Areas are. A Highway Urban Area is composed of adjacent census tracts that have a total population of more than 5,000 in the area. There are two categories, Urbanized Areas with a population over 50,000 and Urban Clusters with a population between 5,000 and 50,000. The 2000 Highway Urban Areas were shown on a map and list provided to the Board members.

The next step is to 'smooth' the Highway Urban Area Boundaries. This involves moving the boundaries out, where needed, to include entire city limits, place the boundary on features easily recognized on the ground (rivers, roads, railroads, etc.), and other adjustments. This is done by the MPO in Urbanized Areas and the RTPPO in Urban Clusters.

Once the Highway Urban Area Boundaries are finalized, they are approved by the FHWA. Then the Federal Function Class is revised for those roads affected by the new Highway Urban Area Boundary, and approved by the FHWA.

The location of the Highway Urban Area Boundaries affects the County Road Departments. Urban roads (those within the Highway Urban Area Boundary) should be designed to adopted urban standards, rural roads to adopted rural standards. Urban roads are eligible for Transportation Improvement Board funds; rural roads are eligible for RAP funding. The methodology utilized in the Gas Tax Allocation Factor formula has greater cost factors for urban roads, which provides more gas tax revenues for an urban road segment than an equivalent rural road segment.

For these reasons, the County Engineer should be involved in the smoothing process. In early 2002 we asked the appropriate WSDOT people about the status of the Highway Urban Area Boundary and Federal Function Class update process. We found that the process had not really been started. In order to ensure the needs of the Counties were represented, we joined the task force that will administer the process.

The current schedule for this process is:

- CRAB staff has provided every County Engineer with information on the process, and a copy of the map and list.
- There will be regional meetings to discuss the process with MPO/RTPO, WSDOT, and local agency staff in each of the WSDOT Regions (Eastern Washington the third week in October, Western Washington in November)
- CRAB staff will provide assistance, at the County Engineer's request, in all phases of this process.
- CRAB staff will continue working with the task force to ensure that County Road Department needs are met.

The Highway Urban Area Boundaries will most likely be approved by FHWA in the spring of 2003. The Federal Function Class update is expected to take six to nine months, with a likely FHWA approval date in the winter of 2003.

Mr. Whitcher concluded with the following recommendations:

- Request CRAB staff be involved in the process to ensure County Road Department needs are met.
- Request CRAB staff to provide any assistance requested by County Engineers.

After Board discussion, Mr. Weber requested staff to keep the Board abreast of developments, especially those Board members representing affected counties.

RURAL ARTERIAL PROGRAM/COUNTY ARTERIAL PRESERVATION PROGRAM PRESENTATION

Mr. Hart gave an informative power point presentation on the Rural Arterial Program and the County Arterial Preservation Program.

INFORMATION SERVICES

After a brief overview of CRAB's involvement in County road design systems history, Mr. Hillesland introduced Jim Ayres and Dan Dickson who gave informative power point presentations on the recent 2002 Road Design Conference and the Road Design Program Eagle Point.

Mobility Update

Mr. Hillesland noted, as mentioned at the July meeting, that the IS team was not satisfied with the progress of the Mobility project and were in the process of rethinking which direction to go.

He noted that staff has begun a comprehensive review to very purposefully reevaluate strategy, design and concept of the project.

As part of the review, staff has brought back to the table every option or strategy we could imagine and even brought in outside help for assessment of the project to make sure that something important wasn't missed. The development environment, changes in technology, and the state of public and private products available have been reevaluated. He noted that staff has made good progress and are on a clear course.

Mr. Hillesland then referred to a new issue which he felt the Board should be made aware of and which may affect the development direction and therefore the progress of Mobility. He related how the county engineers have recently begun to express more and more frustration and dissatisfaction with their individual Cost Accounting Software (CAS). Although CAS has not been part of the CRIS or Mobility development plan, CRAB would like to respond to this need by assisting in the selection of a CAS, and that it would be preferable to integrate Mobility with a chosen CAS.

Mr. Hillesland then noted that a former partnership with the Association of Oregon Counties (AOC) might provide an opportunity to respond to the need for a CAS. He described the history of collaboration between the AOC and CRAB, the success that AOC has had in developing a CAS, the positive evaluation that a number of our county engineers had given the AOC's CAS, and the recent progress made in renewing our favorable relationship with the AOC. He concluded by noting some of the opportunities and challenges in negotiating for and implementing the AOC software for our counties.

After discussion, the Board instructed staff to proceed with more evaluation of partnership with the AOC.

Mr. Breshears moved and Commissioner Scheibe seconded to adjourn at 12:35 PM. **Motion carried.**

Chairman

ATTEST: _____